



3. On July 29, 2022, following the appearance of Plaintiffs' present counsel, the Court took the fully-briefed motion to dismiss the First Amended Complaint under advisement. (Dkt. #106).

4. On August 19, 2022, while the motion to dismiss the First Amended Complaint was under advisement with the Court, Plaintiffs filed a Second Amended Complaint. (Dkt. #112).

5. As of the instant Motion, Defendants' original Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. #61) has not been ruled upon by this Honorable Court, but the Second Amended Complaint contains the same defective allegations and claims made by the Non-Purchaser Plaintiffs' in the First Amended Complaint. (*Compare* Dkt. #52 and Dkt. #112).

6. Defendants bring this *Renewed* Motion to Dismiss, incorporating their original Memorandum of Law (Dkt. #62) and Reply in Support (Dkt. # 81). The Second Amended Complaint adds no additional paragraphs, and makes only minimal substantive changes to the allegations in the First Amended Complaint, all of which relate to the alleged geographic scope of PBD's and HSW's sales activities. The Second Amended Complaint does not include new allegations as to the relevant product market, the alleged sales of merchandise packages, or any of the other factors Defendants cited in support of their earlier motion. Therefore, the parties' prior briefing on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss adequately addresses all relevant arguments, and no updates to any record citations in the briefing are necessary.

7. Through the First Amended Complaint (Dkt. #52) and now through the Second Amended Complaint (Dkt. #112), Plaintiff Power Buying Dealers USA, Inc. ("PBD") seeks to bring the two additional Non-Purchaser Plaintiffs into this case based on alleged injuries to those parties that are wholly derivative of PBD's alleged antitrust injury. As described in detail in the Defendants' prior briefs (*see* Dkt. # 62, 81), the Non-Purchaser Plaintiffs do not state plausible

claims for violations of the Robinson-Patman Act, nor do their allegations establish standing to sue JLI or HSW under antitrust law, based on the factors in *Associated General Contractors of California v. California State Council of Carpenters*, 459 U.S. 519 (1983).

WHEREFORE, JLI and HSW respectfully request that the Court dismiss all of Cr@zy Us's and Power Energy's claims in the Second Amended Complaint.

Dated: September 9, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

Juul Labs, Inc.

HS Wholesale, Limited

By: /s/ Lauren M. Loew  
Lauren Michelle Loew  
Elizabeth Price Mazzocco  
Foley & Lardner LLP  
321 N. Clark St.  
Suite 3000  
Chicago, IL 60654  
lloew@foley.com  
emazzocco@foley.com

By: /s/ Michael A. Jacobson  
James A. Morsch  
Michael A. Jacobson  
Saul Ewing Arnstein & Lehr LLP  
161 North Clark Street  
Suite 4200  
Chicago, IL 60601  
michael.jacobson@saul.com

James T. McKeown  
Foley & Lardner LLP  
777 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, WI 53202  
jmckeown@foley.com

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Elizabeth P. Mazzocco, an attorney, certify that on September 9, 2022 I caused the foregoing **DEFENDANTS JUUL LABS INC.'S AND HS WHOLESALE, LIMITED'S RENEWED MOTION TO DISMISS ALL CLAIMS OF PLAINTIFFS CR@ZY US, LLC AND POWER ENERGY CORPORATION** to be filed with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system for the District Court of the Northern District of Illinois, which will send an electronic copy of the foregoing to counsel of record and constitutes service pursuant to Local Rule 5.9 of the Northern District of Illinois.

/s/ Elizabeth P. Mazzocco

Elizabeth P. Mazzocco